DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 717 SP 001 556

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR STAFF TRAINING (PROJECT FAST).
Detroit Public Schools, Mich.
Pub Date Mar 68
Note-35p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.48
Descriptors-ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, CUSTODIAN TRAINING, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *INSERVICE EDUCATION, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, QUESTIONNAIRES, SECRETARIES, *STAFF IMPROVEMENT, TEACHER AIDES, TEACHER EDUCATION
Identifiers-FAST, Federal Assistance for Staff Training

A study was conducted to evalu"te the effectiveness of Federal Assistance for Staff Training, a project offering inservice education in a workshop format to 6,226 administrators, teachers, secretaries, custodians, and parent-teacher aides from Detroit public and parochial schools. Goals were (1) improving the competencies of staff in their dealings with underprivileged children and (2) facilitating development of materials designed to be applicable to the instruction of underprivileged children. Data were gathered by means of a locally developed Workshop Evaluation Form and the observations of evaluators from the Detroit Public Schools Research and Development Department who observed 36 workshop sessions. Limitations of the evaluation are that (1) only participator comment and observer report were used, (2) effects of the workshops upon children's attitudes, attainments, and interests were not studies, (3) in such a large project it is difficult to establish criteria applicable to all the types of workshops. It was found that participants strongly approved the project and believed its objectives were achieved. Also, Research Department observers reported favorably on all workshops, although they preferred participant oriented to lecture oriented workshops and multiple meeting to single meeting workshops. Eight recommendations evolved from the evaluation. (Author/SG)

Detroit Public Schools	SUMMARY OF PROJECT EVALUATION (ESEA, TITLE I)	Research and Development March, 1968

Title Federal Assistance for Staff Training (Project FAST)

Purpose To evaluate the project's effectiveness in improving the competencies of staff in their dealings with underprivileged children, and in their development of materials designed to be applicable to the instruction of underprivileged children.

Investigators The Research and Development Department, Program Evaluation Section; John Curtin, Herbert Sanders, evaluators.

Period September 6, 1966, through August 31, 1967.

Subjects 6,226 staff members from Detroit public and parochial schools participated in the training sessions, which usually followed a workshop format. This inservice education was offered to administrators, teachers, secretaries, custodians, and parent-teacher aides.

Procedures Evaluative data were gathered through the use of the Workshop Evaluation form. Evaluators from the Research and Development Department visited and observed 36 of the workshop sessions.

Analysis The item tally for the Workshop Evaluation form is reported in tabular form. Open-ended comments of participants concerning the effectiveness of the workshops are presented, as are observations of evaluator-visitors.

Findings The participants, many of whom attended more than one workshop or facet of the project, expressed strong approval of the project. Participants indicated that the objectives of the separate facets of the FAST project were achieved.

The Research Department observers issued favorable reports on all workshops. They tended, however, to favor multiple meeting workshops over single meeting workshops and participant oriented workshops over lecture oriented workshops.

Recommendations Data presented in this report provide the basis for the following recommendations. It is recommended:

1. that future FAST programs concentrate on in-depth studies or multiple-meeting workshops
2. that priority be given to local school or constellation studies

SP001556
ED022717

3. that workshop participants be given a role, other than that of auditor

4. that follow-up sessions for subject matter workshops be scheduled

5. that the college summer programs for teachers who are teaching in areas in which they are not certificated should be continued.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

F E D E R A L A S S I S T A N C E F O R

S T A F F T R A I N I N G

Research and Development Department
Program Evaluation Section
Detroit Public Schools
March, 1968

SP001556

EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR STAFF TRAINING

Background of the Project

The Problem

In addition to providing for the education of some 290,000 students, the Detroit Public Schools recognizes the school system's responsibility for recruitment, training, and the continuous development of the total staff.

Large cities, unfortunately, have a disproportionate share of citizenry who are economically and socially displaced. Many families are part of sub-cultures which have experienced deprivation and poverty. The children of such families pose particular problems for educators. Colleges of Education have only recently recognized that these children, the products of deprivation, require special educational attention. Teachers of these children must possess a thorough knowledge of the respective sub-cultures. They must, in addition, have the training that will enable them to perform remedial tasks.

Teachers and other staff members recruited for work in the Detroit Public Schools have varied backgrounds. Some come from rural areas. Some are returning to the field of education after an absence of several years. They do not possess, then, the unique training required for teaching in an inner-city or core area school. Project FAST (Federal Assistance for Staff Training) was initiated to bring the forces of federal funding to bear on what has been an enormous training problem, the continuing education of teachers and other staff members.

The Purposes of the FAST Project

The FAST program was administered by the Continuing Education Department of the Office for the Improvement of Instruction. For administrative purposes the FAST program was divided into several areas or facets. The objectives of each facet are listed below.

Facet One

To improve the local school's programs through workshops and planning sessions for the professional staffs in each project school. Eligibility for project schools was established by using 1960 census data--mean income, unemployment rates, etc.

Facet Two

To continue established in-service training programs. This facet was not financed under the Elementary and Secondary School Act. It is listed here only to present the complete picture of the total in-service education program.

Facet Three

To introduce new instructional techniques and the results of recent research to teachers of the disadvantaged. Included in this phase are pilot and demonstration efforts, and the development of instructional materials.

Facet Four

To improve the administration of project schools by training staff other than teachers. This includes training for secretarial and custodial staff, but the facet is devoted primarily to conducting seminars and visitations for supervisors and administrators.

Facet Five

To identify the attitudes of staff members toward children and their cultures. This phase is predicated on the assumption that self-awareness will result in better teaching.

Facet Six

To provide varieties of experiences for staff members through cultural enrichment workshops in the arts, internships in occupational settings different from their own, and programs of planned travel.

The rationale for every FAST Project was to improve the competencies of staff in their dealings with underprivileged children or to develop materials which were designed to be applicable to the instruction of underprivileged children.

Operation and Evaluation of the Project

The Continuing Education Department of the Detroit Public Schools was established in January, 1963. The responsibility for the in-service education of teachers was assumed by this department. Because of the shortage of substitute teachers, most in-service training was conducted after regular school hours, on Saturdays and during the summer months. Project FAST first became operational in April of 1966 and was administered by the Continuing Education Department. The basic Continuing Education structure of holding workshops sessions after regular school hours was adopted by Project FAST. However, with the availability of federal funds it was possible, on a limited basis, to hire substitutes and to release teachers to visit on-going educational projects and to attend vital conferences which necessarily were conducted during school hours. Teachers participating in workshops meeting after school hours were paid a stipend.

The workshop procedures originally established by the Continuing Education Department were particularly suited to the launching of Project FAST. Adoption of the Continuing Education Department procedures, stipend payment, etc., insured a smooth administration for the project. Basically, then, FAST used the established workshop format, but the content of such workshops was now geared to training staff for efficient functioning in inner-city areas. Efforts were now marshaled to bring the achievement of disadvantaged children up to national norms. This goal was pursued by tailoring the training of staff to operate in unique and peculiar teaching situations.

One feature of Project FAST which has persisted from the months of its inception through the operation of the 1967 Summer Program was autonomy of action. Although established workshop procedures were fundamental to the program, directors of the project were receptive to new ideas and suggestions. Administrative help was given to principals, teachers and department heads--who were in day-to-day contact with

underprivileged children--in setting up workshops and studies that a reviewing committee deemed had particular merit. A classroom teacher now could receive funds and administrative help to develop a technique or to design materials which were specifically planned for her charges of the moment, core-city students.

FACET ONE

In its first year of operation, the 1965-66 school year and during the summer of 1966, Project FAST local school workshops, served over 3,000 teachers. For the period of this report the Facet One, local school workshop phase of the project served over 4,000 teachers. Facet One, offered many types of workshops, each of which could be fitted to one of the following models.

Model 1A

Staff members of project-eligible schools, under the direction of the school principal, cooperatively planned in-service workshops which were tailored to the needs of the local school. A total of 110 workshops of this nature were conducted. Most of these workshops were concerned with curriculum innovations and community studies.

Model 1B

This model was designed to enable the staffs of individual schools or of constellations of schools to work in-depth for an extended period of time on instructional, community, or staff problems. Each of the nine regions of the Detroit Public Schools conducted at least one in-depth study.

Model 1C

This model was designed to provide an opportunity for small groups of teachers within a local school staff, or teachers of the same subject area in a constellation of schools, to study the problems in curriculum and instructional technology which had been identified through previous efforts of the school staffs. Sixteen Detroit Public Schools and one parochial school workshop were organized under this model in the summer of 1967.

Model 1D

Eight regional orientation workshops were held during the summer of 1967. In addition, one workshop for teachers newly assigned to parochial schools was organized. These workshops were organized to provide an opportunity to acquire a better and fuller understanding of the problems involved in teaching in a disadvantaged school in a large urban area. More than 250 newly appointed teachers participated in the workshops.

Facet One workshops, in terms of budget and numbers of participants, was the predominant mode employed in Project FAST for the continuing education of staff. Facets 3, 4, 5, and 6, however, were also designed to make contributions toward attainment of the ultimate goal of increasing the achievement of under-privileged children. The operation of these facets is outlined below. Facet One proposals accounted for 45 percent of the total FAST budget.

During the period of this report a sample of 20 Facet One workshops was visited by Research Department evaluators. In addition to these observations a sample of 1,967 Workshop Evaluation forms was processed. This form, shown in Appendix A, was adapted from a form which was developed by Ohio State University.

The Workshop Evaluation forms were administered in 56 workshops. In only 6 workshops was there more than a 10 percent negative response to any one item. Among these items were--"There was very little time for informal conversation;" and "We worked together as a group." Negative responses to these items are an indication that at least some workshop participants objected to a lecture format. Appendix B contains an item tally (frequency and percent) for the responses made on Workshop Evaluation forms completed by public and parochial school participants in Facet One workshops. Workshops with a curriculum content and "Local School" workshops (studies of students or community) were tallied separately.

The Research Department observers issued favorable reports on all Facet One workshops. They tended, however, to favor multiple-meeting workshops over single-meeting workshops and participant-oriented workshops over lecture-oriented workshops.

FACET THREE

While some Facet Three workshops were conducted at the local school level, most were conducted by Office for the Improvement of Instruction specialists. Teachers of the disadvantaged from a constellation, region, or from the entire school system were invited to participate. In addition to the demonstration of instructional techniques in the basic curriculum areas, unique projects such as the development of films for Biological Sciences Curriculum Study courses, and the development of materials for courses at the Detroit Day School for the Deaf were financed under this facet. Facet Three workshops accounted for 20 percent of the total of FAST proposals.

A Research Department evaluator visited a Facet Three workshop that was conducted by parochial schools of the Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit. This particular session of the workshop (Assessing the Business Education Needs of Disadvantaged Youth) was held at the Detroit Business College. Five parochial school teachers saw demonstrations of business machines and heard about the latest office practices. In the opinion of the evaluator, this experience would have been more valuable if, since only five teachers were involved, the teachers had been given actual practice on all of the machines or if they had been assigned an actual problem, e.g., computation of a payroll to be completed with the aid of the machines.

The Workshop Evaluation form was completed by participants in the following Facet Three workshops: (1) Training of Planetarium Demonstrators, Children's Museum, N=5. (2) Biological Sciences Curriculum Study Film Projects, Mathematics and Science Education Department, N=43. (3) Commercial Foods, Vocational Education Department, N=8. (4) Making Single Concept Films, Detroit Day School for the Deaf, N=30. (5) The Multi-Discipline Team Approach to the Problems of the Inner City Child, School Social Work Services, N=32. Appendix C contains the total item tally for the foregoing workshops.

FACET FOUR

Efforts to improve the administration of schools which serve disadvantaged youngsters were concentrated in the pilot project--Administrative Candidates Training (A.C.T.) and in visits by administrators to other large cities where innovative

changes were being undertaken. Facet Four projects accounted for approximately 10 percent of the total FAST budget.

Project A.C.T. initially started with 12 candidates who were on the assistant principals' promotion list. Starting in February, 1967, each participant was placed in school offices, serving directly under the principal of the school in which he was placed. In effect, they were acting assistant principals. The entire group of twelve met once a week to review their experiences and to hear lectures by authorities in the field of administration. Joint meetings with the 12 sponsoring principals were sometimes conducted. In the summer of 1967, the 12 candidates were enrolled, for graduate credit, in a Wayne State University course in educational administration that was tailored to their needs. Twelve additional candidates were added to the summer program, providing an enrollment of 24 for the university course.

A Research Department evaluator was present at the biweekly meetings of the Administrative Candidates Training Program. During these meetings, incidents at participating schools which required administrative decisions were discussed. Professors from nearby universities and administrators and supervisors from the Detroit Public Schools were often guests at the meetings.

Time at these meetings was made available to the Research Department evaluator for the administration of a battery of attitude and interests instruments. Among these was the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, the Gordon Personal Inventory, the Leader Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire, and the Litwak-Meyers Social Values Test. No norms were established for the latter instrument although the responses of 724 public school teachers and 293 social workers were available for comparison. Permission to administer this questionnaire was obtained from Henry J. Meyers, co-author of the test, with the understanding that it would be used only as "a means of sensitizing persons to some of their own attitudes in the value areas covered." On the basis of these test administrations, profiles were prepared for each of the 12 candidates.

The Leader Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire was also administered, on a voluntary basis, to the faculties of the administrative candidate's sponsoring school. There was evidence that the administration of the Leader Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire contributed to self-awareness. One candidate remarked--"I would like to know if the (faculty) completions on the LBDQ were consistent with mine--if we see ourselves as others do. I think this could help me."

In spite of all assurances to the contrary, there was some apprehension that results of the diagnostic inventories would be placed in the candidates' records and become a part of future promotion and selection processes. In view of this apprehension, the director of the Administrative Candidates Training Program determined that the inventory scores would not be reported, but would be filed for possible future use in establishing norms for potential administrators.

The following candidate comment expresses the concensus attitude of participants in the Administrative Candidates Training Program--"It is difficult to imagine administrators being able to do the efficient job many are doing without the benefit of prior training such as we have had."

Academic Training for Those Teachers Teaching Outside Their Area of Specialization was a summer program of Facet Four. Under this program some 40 teachers were enrolled in university courses for the purpose of working toward state certification in certain critical areas.

In terms of numbers, mathematics appears to be the most critical of these areas. Of 385 teachers now (spring, 1968) teaching mathematics in Detroit Junior High Schools, 141 are certificated in areas other than mathematics. The Elementary and Junior High Mathematics Supervisor has stated that the shortage of qualified mathematics teachers is even more acute in the elementary grades.

The FAST program provided tuition money for teachers enrolled in regular university courses and, in addition, provided up to fifteen dollars per day in expense money for those teachers who attended out-of-state universities. The mathematics supervisor would like to see daily stipend of fifteen dollars granted to all participants in this program. This may provide sufficient income to attract those teachers who find it necessary to work in the summer.

An accurate assessment of this program would involve observation of the college courses and a followup of the participating teachers. However, since certification was the primary objective and since all of the teachers completed the summer courses, we can say that participants are 6 or 8 credit hours closer to their goal.

Two of the teachers while they completed the summer program, resigned from the Detroit Public Schools before the opening of school in the fall. In the event this program is funded for future summers, a commitment to teach in Title I schools for the ensuing year might be secured from participating teachers.

A Research Department evaluator visited an Occupational Orientation Workshop, Facet Four, which was held at the Schools Center Building on May 6, 1967. Don M. Thomas, Special Assistant, Corporate Personnel Staff, Chrysler Corporation was the speaker. Participants in this workshop were counselors from Title I eligible parochial schools and Detroit Public Schools. Mr. Thomas apprised the group of vocational opportunities and hiring procedures within the Chrysler Corporation.

The following are comments from individual participants which were expressed before the group:

> The whole day is wasted if they don't change the role of the counselor in Detroit. They are paying us for nothing today.
>
> Vocational teachers would benefit more from such a workshop. They have contact with the students. Counselors do not have contact with the students.

Appendix D contains a sampling of responses to the Workshop Evaluation form by participants in Facet Four activities. Since there was a small number of programs and workshops under this facet, the sampling is correspondingly small.

FACET FIVE

The attitude study facet, Facet Five, conducted Values and Attitudes Learning Seminars during the regular school year and sponsored participants in a Sensitivity Training Workshop which was held at Camp Kett, Cadillac, Michigan.

The Values and Attitudes Learning Seminars were conducted at a convenient meeting place, usually a local restaurant. Approximately 12 participants, under a director, analyzed attitudes toward children and education. Facet Five proposals accounted for approximately 10 percent of the total FAST budget.

A Research Department evaluator participated in two organizational meetings of the Values and Attitudes Learning Seminars and visited three sessions of different seminar groups. These groups of 12 participants met each week for a period of one semester. One participant recommended that this time period be shortened to four or six weeks so that new groups of teachers might be exposed to the program.

The seminar meetings were held at the end of the school day at public restaurant facilities. While most participants recognized that an informal dining setting made a unique contribution to the program, there were individual demurrals on this feature. One participant felt that individual orders were unnecessary and recommended that a common menu be provided for each meeting. At one dinner meeting that was visited by a Research Department evaluator, the participants admitted to having feelings of guilt about the seminars. There seemed to be some incongruity in attending a dinner meeting, in a somewhat opulent setting, for the purposes of discussing attitudes toward underprivileged children. The seminar director, a social worker from a state agency, allayed these fears with the comment that apparently teachers needed to improve their self-image. He asked which products, children or automobiles, were more important, and he pointed out that auto companies thought nothing of spending large amounts of money on dinner meetings if the purposes for holding such a meeting were achieved.

One seminar group appeared, to the Research Department observers, to have especially fruitful discussions. The members of this particular group were all teachers from the same junior high school. The seminar director was a principal of a junior high from a neighboring region. An excellent teacher-administrator dialogue appeared to have developed. Each session started with the teachers airing their complaints of the day about the operation of their junior high school. The director skillfully and tactfully guided the participants and elicited their opinions as to how a particular administrative situation should have been handled. Interestingly enough, the group could not agree and many seemed to appreciate that, under the circumstance the principal had made the best possible decision.

Participant reaction to all of the seminars was very positive. Many expressed the desire for an "advanced" seminar or for the followup meetings and many recommended that their experience be made available to more teachers of the disadvantaged. Appendix E contains the responses of seminar participants to the "Workshop Evaluation" form.

FACET SIX

Facet Six projects provided cultural opportunities and work experiences for teachers and counselors. Art, Literature, Music, and Community Development Seminars were conducted during the regular school year. During the summer of 1967, Programs of Planned Travel to the Washington-Baltimore area, New York City, and to out-state Michigan were conducted. A six weeks' work experience was provided for 61 interns in an Internship Experience Project. The experiences in the internship program varied from factory and warehouse jobs, to business office, and social work agency experience. Facet Six proposals accounted for some 15 percent of the total program budget.

Most programs under this facet did not follow the workshop format. The goals of providing cultural experiences, inter-city visitations, and work internships for teachers, counselors, and administrators resulted in the following unique modes of operation.

Programs of Planned Travel

Bus trips of two weeks' duration were made to outstate Michigan, New York City, and the Washington-Baltimore area. These trips were scheduled for late July and August, 1967. It was recommended by participants that, if this program is continued, the trips be planned for earlier in the summer when summer school sessions are in full operation. The trips balanced visits to historical and cultural sites with visits to federally sponsored compensatory education projects.

Brief questionnaires were designed by the Research and Development Department for participants in the Planned Travel Program. Impressions as to how one trip met its objectives are contained in Table VI, Appendix F.

Some participants stated that, after visiting Title I programs in other cities, they were particularly proud of the Title I programs administered by the Detroit Board of Education.

Seminars in the Understanding of Contemporary Culture

Five seminars were offered under Facet Six of FAST. These seminars were conducted for those teachers and administrators in Title I, ESEA schools who wished to deepen their understanding of the cultural opportunities available in Detroit. Each seminar group consisted of approximately 30 teachers and a director who met throughout the spring semester (February-June, 1967). The seminars were as follows:

Seminars in Community Development
Seminar in Contemporary Aspects of Music
Journeys into Art Enrichment
Experiences in the Visual Arts
Seminar in Contemporary Literature
Seminar in the Theatre Arts

A Research Department evaluator was an observer at all sessions of the Community Development Seminar and visits were made to at least one session of each of the other seminars.

In the Music and in the Theatre seminars, attendance at concerts and plays was preceded by lectures. Many teachers credited the lectures with heightening their aesthetic appreciation and increasing their critical acumen. Perhaps the lecture series was too successful. At the last lecture-performance of the Theatre Seminar, some participants had adopted the cosmopolitan practice of walking out on a performance.

On a tour of Henry Ford Museum--Greenfield Village, participants were permitted to make purchases in the gift shop and submit bills for articles which were valued up to ten dollars. One participant remarked to the Research Department observers that she would not spend her own money on objets d'art at gift shop prices and therefore would not make purchases to be billed to a federal account.

The Community Development Seminar brought 30 teachers together to study urban government, urban renewal, and community relations. This group was able to visit the Detroit Common Council in session. They interviewed councilmen and directors of various city agencies. They toured urban renewal areas and met with housing and rapid transit planners. They also met with clergymen and social workers and participated in community renewal discussions.

A followup evaluation of the Community Development Seminar was conducted by the Research and Development Department. A one-page questionnaire was mailed to each of the 30 teachers and administrators who participated in the project. Since 23 participants responded, there was a return rate of 77 percent. There appears to be some evidence that the benefits of FAST workshops and seminars are disseminated to non-participating teachers and indeed there is some evidence that the actual products, inner-city students, share in this feedback.

Community Development Seminar participants were asked whether they discussed the seminar with faculty colleagues and whether they likewise discussed it with their students. Among the respondents, 92 percent had "complimentary" and "enthusiastic" discussions with colleagues who were "approving" or "strongly approving." Only 65 percent of the participants found occasion to discuss any of the seminar visits with their students. One participant mentioned that the students were too young. Another participant volunteered that the meetings were also discussed with parents of the students.

Table VII, Appendix F contains the responses of Contemporary Culture seminar participants to the Workshop Evaluation form.

Internship Experience Project

Under Facet Six of the FAST program, an internship of six weeks' duration was designed for teachers and counselors. Teachers worked in industry, business, and at social agencies. Some worked in Detroit factories at the kinds of jobs students' parents presently perform and at the kind of job the students themselves may eventually perform. Some vocational and business education teachers worked in department stores, food stores, and other commercial agencies. Some counselors worked for social agencies and learned, first hand, the operation of agencies to which they are now referring or may some day be referring students.

A questionnaire, designed by the Research and Development Department, was distributed to the 61 interns participating in the project. Of the 51 interns who returned the questionnaire, 41 percent had previously participated in FAST sponsored local school workshops and 25 percent had participated in more than one FAST activity. This intern group, which included many FAST veterans, was asked to rate FAST activities in the order of their importance and 53 percent gave the internship program the top rating. Supervisor Questionnaires were distributed to the 35 employers. The supervisors supplied ratings for 28 interns. The supervisors rated 82 percent of these interns to be equal to or more competent than other beginning employees.

Ratings of the achievement of the program objectives were made by the interns, and the ratings of the intern's achievement of program objectives were made by the supervisors. A comparison of these ratings is displayed in Table VIII of Appendix F.

Cost Analysis

The cost of the FAST Project per participant was $204. This figure was calculated by dividing $1,272,347, the estimated amount expended, by 6,226, the number of personnel participating in the project.

Limitations

The ultimate goal of Project FAST was to attain gains in achievement for disadvantaged pupils, to enhance pupil image, and to encourage positive attitudes toward school and learning. The present evaluation depends upon participator comment and observer report for assessment. The effects of the workshops upon children's attitudes, attainments, and interests were not studied. Because Project FAST is only one of the many projects seeking to bring about changes in pupils, it is impossible to isolate and study those changes which may be ascribed to this project alone.

As has been noted, assessment is dependent upon participator comment. We have no direct evidence of actual change in the teachers, no evidence of change in their behavior with pupils, and no evidence of changes in their attitudes or interests.

In a project as large as the FAST program, it is difficult to establish criteria which will be applicable to all of the various projects which are initiated to provide solutions for problems that are often unique. Impressions of the various workshops, as they are recorded on the Workshop Evaluation form were so consistently favorable that this instrument could not be used to discriminate between the excellent workshop and those of lesser worth. This instrument did, however, provide immediate feedback to directors. The open-ended comments that were written on the back of the form were perhaps the best feature of the instrument and these statements provided the basis for many of the recommendations to project administrators.

Conclusion

Analysis of the item tallies presented in Appendices A, B, C, and D gives some evidence that the objectives of Facet One, Three, Four, and Five were achieved. Analysis of items 18 and 23 of the Workshop Evaluation form provide an overview of the several facets. The tally for these items, with Strongly Agree and Agree responses combined and with Strongly Disagree and Disagree responses combined, is presented below.

Workshop Evaluation Form Item	Facet No.	Strongly Agree or Agree		Strongly Disagree or Disagree		Undecided or No Response	
		No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
18. The organization of the workshop was consistent with its purposes	1	1262	94	39	3	46	3
	3	100	85	7	6	11	9
	4	50	100				
	5	98	96	3	3	1	1
23. Workshops of this nature should be offered again in the future	1	1276	95	25	2	46	3
	3	93	79	10	8	15	13
	4	47	94	3	6		
	5	100	98	1	1	1	1

It is interesting to note that a greater percentage of Facet Three participants, in comparison with the participants in the other facets, selected the undecided category or left these items blank. Facet Three workshops were usually conducted by Division of Instruction curriculum specialists. In the opinion of the Research

Department observers there was a high degree of participant involvement in Facet Three workshops and the objectives of these workshops were quite specific. By contrast, Facets One, Four, and Five were more informally organized.

Recommendations

On the basis of participant comment and evaluator observations and conferences with Facet administrators it is recommended:

1. That future FAST programs concentrate on in-depth studies or multiple-meeting workshops. Many participants complained of a furious pace and too much content. In this connection workshop directors should be reminded of the value of social periods and rest breaks.

2. That priority be given to local school or constellation studies. Local school control would permit the principal to use his influence to control excessive tardiness and absenteeism among the participants. It would also prevent participants from registering for more than one FAST project within a specified time period.

3. That participants be given definite work assignments or roles. Often the only participant role is that of auditor.

4. That, in the case of individual independent studies such as inter-city visitations, a formal means of dissemination be established. This could take the form of a faculty meeting report.

5. That followup sessions for subject matter workshops be scheduled. This should help close the gap between theory and practice. A follow-up session a month or two after a series of modern math meetings would provide time for a discussion of operational difficulties, etc.

6. That the Regional Orientation Workshops be continued. Although local school workshops have been recommended, the Orientation Workshops appear to provide the necessary service of introducing teachers with varying backgrounds to the sometimes formidable task of instructing in a large city school system.

7. That the college summer program for teachers who are teaching in areas in which they are not certificated be continued. A daily stipend of $15 should be considered for all participants in this program. This would provide an inducement for teachers to obtain certification in areas of critical teacher shortages.

8. That some form of orientation for new administrators be conducted. This orientation might incorporate many of the features of A.C.T., the Administrative Candidates Training program.

APPENDIX A

WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

Detroit Public Schools

WORKSHOP EVALUATION*

Research and Development

Name of Workshop _____

Place _____ Date _____

Use a No. 2 pencil. Mark firmly, but do not go beyond the response block (▯). Erasures must be thorough. Response choices are as follows:
SA-Strongly Agree, A-Agree, U-Undecided, D-Disagree, SD-Strongly Disagree.

		SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	The purposes of the workshop were clear to me	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
2.	The objectives of this workshop were <u>not</u> realistic	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
3.	Specific purposes made it easy to work efficiently	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
4.	The workshop objectives were <u>not</u> the objectives I expected	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
5.	I didn't learn anything new	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
6.	The material presented was valuable to me	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
7.	I could have learned as much by reading a book	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
8.	Possible solutions to my problems were considered	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
9.	The information presented was too elementary	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
10.	The instructors really knew their subjects	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
11.	I was stimulated to think objectively about the topic presented	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
12.	We worked together as a group	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
13.	We did <u>not</u> relate theory to practice	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
14.	There was very little time for informal conversation	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
15.	I did <u>not</u> have the opportunity to express my ideas	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
16.	I really felt myself to be a part of this group	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
17.	My time was well spent	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
18.	The organization of the workshop was consistent with its purposes	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
19.	I received <u>no</u> guide for further action	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
20.	Too much time was devoted to trivial matters	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
21.	The information presented was too advanced	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
22.	The content presented was <u>not</u> applicable to the work I do	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
23.	Workshops of this nature should be offered again in the future	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
24.	Workshops such as this will contribute little to changes in education	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯

Please write your comments or suggestions for workshop improvement on the other side of this form. The form should be returned, unfolded, to the Research and Development Department, Special Projects Building.

*This form is an adaptation of one developed by Ohio State University.

3-67

UTILITY FORM 2333 OPTICAL SCANNING FORMS © OPTICAL SCANNING CORPORATION, FAIRLESS HILLS

APPENDIX B

RESPONSES OF FACET ONE PARTICIPANTS

TO THE WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

TABLE I

Responses of 595 Facet One "Local School" Workshop Participants to the WORKSHOP EVALUATION Form

Item	Agree		Disagree		Undecided or No Response	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
1. The purposes of the workshop were clear to me	578	97	3	1	14	2
2. The objectives of this workshop were <u>not</u> realistic	36	6	535	90	24	4
3. Specific purposes made it easy to work efficiently	515	87	19	3	61	10
4. The workshop objectives were <u>not</u> the objectives I expected	46	8	512	86	37	6
5. I didn't learn anything new	39	7	544	91	12	2
6. The material presented was valuable to me	550	92	17	3	28	5
7. I could have learned as much by reading a book	42	7	513	86	40	7
8. Possible solutions to my problems were considered	494	83	34	6	68	11
9. The information presented was too elementary	26	4	553	93	16	3
10. The instructors really knew their subjects	560	94	14	2	21	4
11. I was stimulated to think objectively about the topic presented	531	89	23	4	41	7
12. We worked together as a group	536	90	26	4	33	6

TABLE I (continued)

	Item	Agree		Disagree		Undecided or No Response	
		No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
13.	We did not relate theory to practice	61	10	483	81	51	9
14.	There was very little time for informal conversation	87	15	486	82	21	3
15.	I did not have the opportunity to express my ideas	24	4	550	93	21	3
16.	I really felt myself to be a part of this group	552	93	15	2	28	5
17.	My time was well spent	619	92	18	3	28	5
18.	The organization of the workshop was consistent with its purposes	556	94	18	3	21	3
19.	I received no guide for further action	31	5	531	89	33	6
20.	Too much time was devoted to trivial matters	34	6	536	90	25	4
21.	The information presented was too advanced	7	1	582	98	6	1
22.	The content presented was not applicable to the work I do	20	3	548	92	27	5
23.	Workshops of this nature should be offered again in the future	556	94	14	2	25	4
24.	Workshops such as this will contribute little to changes in education	19	2	702	93	31	4

TABLE II

Responses of 752 Facet One Curriculum Workshop Participants to the WORKSHOP EVALUATION Form

Item	Agree		Disagree		Undecided or No Response	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
1. The purposes of the workshop were clear to me	728	97	9	1	14	2
2. The objectives of this workshop were <u>not</u> realistic	46	6	675	90	31	4
3. Specific purposes made it easy to work efficiently	672	89	29	4	51	7
4. The workshop objectives were <u>not</u> the objectives I expected	63	8	648	88	31	4
5. I didn't learn anything new	35	5	706	94	11	1
6. The material presented was valuable to me	728	97	15	2	9	1
7. I could have learned as much by reading a book	31	4	682	91	39	5
8. Possible solutions to my problems were considered	640	85	38	5	74	10
9. The information presented was too elementary	28	4	706	94	18	2
10. The instructors really knew their subjects	727	96	12	2	13	2
11. I was stimulated to think objectively about the topic presented	696	93	26	3	30	4
12. We worked together as a group	669	89	42	6	41	5

TABLE II (continued)

	Item	Agree		Disagree		Undecided or No Response	
		No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
13.	We did not relate theory to practice	33	4	675	90	44	6
14.	There was very little time for informal conversation	135	18	581	77	36	5
15.	I did not have the opportunity to express my ideas	37	5	684	91	31	4
16.	I really felt myself to be a part of this group	707	94	13	2	32	4
17.	My time was well spent	713	95	17	2	22	3
18.	The organization of the workshop was consistent with its purposes	706	94	21	3	25	3
19.	I received no guide for further action	24	3	697	93	31	4
20.	Too much time was devoted to trivial matters	19	3	700	93	33	4
21.	The information presented was too advanced	7	1	728	97	17	2
22.	The content presented was not applicable to the work I do	22	3	703	93	27	4
23.	Workshops of this nature should be offered again in the future	720	96	11	1	21	3
24.	Workshops such as this will contribute little to changes in education	19	3	702	93	31	4

APPENDIX C

RESPONSES OF FACET THREE PARTICIPANTS

TO THE WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

TABLE III

Responses of 118 Facet Three Workshop Participants to the WORKSHOP EVALUATION Form

Item	Agree		Disagree		Undecided or No Response	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
1. The purposes of the workshop were clear to me	111	94	5	4	2	2
2. The objectives of this workshop were <u>not</u> realistic	22	19	86	73	10	8
3. Specific purposes make it easy to work efficiently	83	70	20	17	15	13
4. The workshop objectives were <u>not</u> the objectives I expected	24	21	84	71	10	8
5. I didn't learn anything new	7	6	107	91	4	3
6. The material presented was valuable to me	96	81	6	5	16	14
7. I could have learned as much by reading a book	5	4	101	86	12	10
8. Possible solutions to my problems were considered	77	65	14	12	27	23
9. The information presented was too elementary	8	7	103	87	7	6
10. The instructors really knew their subjects	94	80	7	6	17	14
11. I was stimulated to think objectively about the topic presented	99	84	5	4	14	12
12. We worked together as a group	103	87	12	10	3	3

TABLE III (continued)

Item	Agree		Disagree		Undecided or No Response	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
13. We did <u>not</u> relate theory to practice	12	10	99	84	7	6
14. There was very little time for informal conversation	1	1	114	96	3	3
15. I did <u>not</u> have the opportunity to express my ideas	7	6	100	93	1	1
16. I really felt myself to be a part of this group	104	88	8	7	6	5
17. My time was well spent	94	80	8	7	16	13
18. The organization of the workshop was consistent with its purposes	100	85	7	6	11	9
19. I received <u>no</u> guide for further action	6	5	97	82	15	13
20. Too much time was devoted to trivial matters	17	14	95	81	6	5
21. The information presented was too advanced	2	2	111	94	5	4
22. The content presented was <u>not</u> applicable to the work I do	7	6	101	86	10	8
23. Workshops of this nature should be offered again in the future	93	79	10	8	15	13
24. Workshops such as this will contribute little to changes in education	6	5	97	82	15	13

APPENDIX D

RESPONSES OF FACET FOUR PARTICIPANTS

TO THE WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

TABLE IV

Responses of 50 Facet 4 Participants to the WORKSHOP EVALUATION Form

Item	Agree		Disagree		Undecided or No Response	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
1. The purposes of the workshop were clear to me	49	98	0	0	1	2
2. The objectives of this workshop were <u>not</u> realistic	6	12	43	86	1	2
3. Specific purposes made it easy to work efficiently	47	94	2	4	1	2
4. The workshop objectives were <u>not</u> the objectives I expected	3	6	46	92	1	2
5. I didn't learn anything new	2	4	48	96	0	0
6. The material presented was valuable to me	50	100	0	0	0	0
7. I could have learned as much by reading a book	0	0	49	98	1	2
8. Possible solutions to my problems were considered	46	92	1	2	3	6
9. The information presented was too elementary	3	6	46	92	1	2
10. The instructors really knew their subjects	48	96	0	0	2	4
11. I was stimulated to think objectively about the topic presented	48	98	1	2	0	0
12. We worked together as a group	48	96	1	2	1	2

TABLE IV (continued)

Item	Agree		Disagree		Undecided or No Response	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
13. We did not relate theory to practice	4	8	44	88	2	4
14. There was very little time for informal conversation	2	4	48	96	0	0
15. I did not have the opportunity to express my ideas	0	0	50	100	0	0
16. I really felt myself to be a part of this group	50	100	0	0	0	0
17. My time was well spent	49	98	0	0	1	2
18. The organization of the workshop was consistent with its purposes	50	100	0	0	0	0
19. I received no guide for further action	1	2	49	98	0	0
20. Too much time was devoted to trivial matters	1	2	49	98	0	0
21. The information presented was too advanced	1	2	49	98	0	0
22. The content presented was not applicable to the work I do	1	2	49	98	0	0
23. Workshops of this nature should be offered again in the future	47	94	3	6	0	0
24. Workshops such as this will contribute little to changes in education	1	2	46	92	3	6

APPENDIX E

RESPONSES OF FACET FIVE PARTICIPANTS

TO THE WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

TABLE V

Responses of 102 Facet Five (Values and Learning Seminars) Participants to the WORKSHOP EVALUATION Form

Item	Agree		Disagree		Undecided or No Response	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
1. The purposes of the workshop were clear to me	91	89	5	5	6	6
2. The objectives of this workshop were <u>not</u> realistic	6	6	90	88	6	6
3. Specific purposes made it easy to work efficiently	69	68	15	14	18	18
4. The workshop objectives were <u>not</u> the objectives I expected	10	10	45	83	7	7
5. I didn't learn anything new	1	1	99	97	2	2
6. The material presented was valuable to me	101	99	1	1	0	0
7. I could have learned as much by reading a book	0	0	101	99	1	1
8. Possible solutions to my problems were considered	88	86	4	4	10	10
9. The information presented was too elementary	1	1	99	97	2	2
10. The instructors really knew their subjects	91	89	3	3	8	8
11. I was stimulated to think objectively about the topic presented	96	94	2	2	4	4
12. We worked together as a group	98	96	1	1	3	3

TABLE V (continued)

Item	Agree		Disagree		Undecided or No Response	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
13. We did not relate theory to practice	7	7	90	88	5	5
14. There was very little time for informal conversation	6	6	92	90	4	4
15. I did not have the opportunity to express my ideas	3	3	96	94	3	3
16. I really felt myself to be a part of this group	101	99	1	1	0	0
17. My time was well spent	97	95	1	1	4	4
18. The organization of the workshop was consistent with its purposes	98	96	1	1	3	3
19. I received no guide for further action	5	5	94	92	3	3
20. Too much time was devoted to trivial matters	2	2	92	90	8	8
21. The information presented was too advanced	1	1	101	99	0	0
22. The content presented was not applicable to the work I do	1	1	100	98	1	1
23. Workshops of this nature should be offered again in the future	100	98	1	1	1	1
24. Workshops such as this will contribute little to changes in education	4	4	92	90	6	6

APPENDIX F

RESPONSES OF FACET SIX PARTICIPANTS

TO EVALUATION FORMS

TABLE VI

Achievement of Objectives, Ratings of 13 Participants in the Washington-Baltimore Planned Travel Program

	Objectives	Mean of Ratings*
1.	To increase ability to help other teachers better understand pupils	3.6
2.	To increase ability to enrich the lives of the children	4.5
3.	To enhance teaching competency	4.2
4.	To increase an awareness of the learning processes experienced by children	4.0
5.	To increase an awareness of cultural influences affecting disadvantaged children	4.4
6.	To provide adequate time for the study aspects of the tour	4.2
7.	To increase an awareness of the human needs of children	4.3
8.	To provide an adequately planned study tour	4.4
9.	To provide beneficial interactions with members of another race	4.8
10.	To provide a satisfactory director	4.3
11.	To provide the participants adequate free time during the tour	3.7
12.	To help correct erroneous opinions I had about other people	3.4
13.	To learn by observing other large urban school systems	4.5

*Five point scale (To a high degree = 5; Not at all = 1)

TABLE VII

Responses of 25 Music Seminar Participants and 27 Community Development Seminar Participants to the WORKSHOP EVALUATION Form

Item	Agree		Disagree		Undecided or No Response	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
1. The purposes of the workshop were clear to me	49	94	1	2	2	4
2. The objectives of this workshop were <u>not</u> realistic	6	11	44	85	2	4
3. Specific purposes made it easy to work efficiently	44	85	2	4	6	11
4. The workshop objectives were <u>not</u> the objectives I expected	6	11	44	85	2	4
5. I didn't learn anything new	1	2	51	98	0	0
6. The material presented was valuable to me	51	98	1	2	0	0
7. I could have learned as much by reading a book	0	0	52	100	0	0
8. Possible solutions to my problems were considered	25	49	7	13	20	38
9. The information presented was too elementary	1	2	49	94	2	4
10. The instructors really knew their subjects	47	90	1	2	4	8
11. I was stimulated to think objectively about the topic presented	49	94	1	2	2	4
12. We worked together as a group	32	61	8	16	12	23

TABLE VII (continued)

Item	Agree		Disagree		Undecided or No Response	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
13. We did not relate theory to practice	2	4	37	71	13	25
14. There was very little time for informal conversation	22	42	27	52	3	6
15. I did not have the opportunity to express my ideas	8	16	36	68	8	16
16. I really felt myself to be a part of this group	39	76	6	11	7	13
17. My time was well spent	50	96	1	2	1	2
18. The organization of the workshop was consistent with its purposes	49	94	1	2	2	4
19. I received no guide for further action	6	11	38	73	8	16
20. Too much time was devoted to trivial matters	1	2	50	96	1	2
21. The information presented was too advanced	0	0	52	100	0	0
22. The content presented was not applicable to the work I do	2	4	45	87	5	9
23. Workshops of this nature should be offered again in the future	50	96	0	0	2	4
24. Workshops such as this will contribute little to changes in education	1	2	47	90	4	8

TABLE VIII

Achievement of Internship Experience Project Objectives

Program Achievement as Rated by Intern	Mean of Ratings*	Intern Achievement as Rated by Supervisor	Mean of Ratings*
To increase ability to provide guidance or counseling services to pupils	4.2	To increase the intern's ability to offer guidance and counseling services to children	3.9
To increase ability to interact with children	3.4	To increase the intern's ability to relate to his students	3.7
To increase awareness of the need for curriculum improvements	3.9	To provide educators with opportunities to realize the need for a more realistic grade school curriculum	3.6
To increase an awareness of the effects other agencies or concerns have on the school community	4.1	To broaden the intern's awareness of the community in which his children reside (characteristics, problems, etc.)	3.8
To increase appreciation for the importance of the teaching profession	4.1	To help the intern and employees of cooperating agencies gain added insight into their regular jobs	3.2
To increase an awareness of the employment opportunities available to my students	3.4	To provide the intern with opportunities to gain insight into the job opportunities available for high school	3.0
To provide an opportunity to win friends for the Detroit Public Schools system	4.1	To increase (for staffs of cooperating agencies (an awareness of the problems of education	3.3
To receive adequate information in the initial announcement about the internship program	2.9	To provide adequate preparation time for the intern and agencies prior to the initiation of the program	2.0
A work experience which provided familiarity with the type of job which students' parents presently perform	3.7	To help the intern better understand the negative views that some children have toward school	3.7

*Five point scale (To a high degree = 5; Not at all = 1)